PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant	City of Chino	**Amount Requested**	$2,400,000
Proposal Title	Pine Avenue Storm Drain Project	**Total Proposal Cost**	$4,900,000

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The Project will construct stormwater drainage facilities including a new box culvert, grading, and channel to avoid or reduce street flooding. Pine Avenue is a primary east west regional arterial connecting commuter traffic as well as local and interstate distribution through the Inland Empire. Closure of the roadway due to flooding results in significant impacts to regional commuter and truck traffic flow, as well as an increase in the region's State and Interstate highway traffic. Deterioration of adequate storm water conveyance in the Chino Preserve continues to threaten the viability public infrastructure, private property, local business, and the ability for the City to provide adequate emergency response. Completing this Project substantially addresses flood protection while supporting efforts to enhance water quality as well as erosion and sediment impacts.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. possible
Work Plan	**6/15**	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	**6/12**
Budget	**2/5**	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	**6/12**
Schedule	**1/5**	Program Preferences	**8/10**
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	**3/5**		
		Total Score (max. possible = 64)	**32**

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The applicant did not provide a summary description of the Project scope. The Work Plan conflicts with other parts of the application. For example, the Goals and Objectives specifically discuss how the Project will address stormwater management issues that affect Pine Avenue, and the Program Preferences state that "This grant project focuses solely on improvements to Pine Avenue within the Preserve project area." Yet, the Proposal implies that the Phase 1 Storm Drain System provides extensive utilities to areas of new

development in the Preserve Project area. The following plans were submitted, although not discussed: Culvert Improvement Plan, Water Improvement Plans for Tract Nos. 17571 and 17572, Street Improvement Plans for Tract Nos. 17571 and 17626, Off-site Street Improvement Plans for Tract No. 17572 & Portion of Tract No. 17057. Task 4 - Assessment and Evaluation - states that all environmental studies have been completed, yet no description of what those studies were is provided. Task 6 - Environmental Documentation states "CEQA document completed and adopted" but no portion of the CEQA document was provided. Also, Resolution 2003-15 adopted a Programmatic EIR. No discussion or work tasks were provided to obtain Project specific CEQA clearance. Existing data and studies were included and two reports were provided; however, there was no description as to what data these reports contained. The scope of work was provided with tasks; however, not enough detail and supporting documentation was provided. For example, Task 5 - Final Design implies that all of the work will take place on Pine Avenue and contains very broad listing of tasks including full street right of way width grading, relocation or undergrounding of Southern CA Edison distribution facilities, and partial street improvements (2 lanes and raised median), but does not mention the water lines or off site street improvements. Also, it is difficult to confirm if the "storm drainage structures and conveyance systems" is the portion of the overall regional water quality treatment train (sediment and associated gross solid removal) discussed in other parts of the proposal. Task 7 – Permitting - gives a list of permits without a description of each and gives no status. IRWMP consistency is claimed, but with no explanation of how it is consistent.

Budget

Not all costs appear reasonable, and supporting documentation is lacking for all of the budget categories. Category A – Direct Project Administration provides no explanation for the percent of a PY time equivalent of the staff level involvement; nor is it clear how they derived the $120 blended rate. Although the Budget narrative for Row (b) Land Purchase / Easement states that the property appraisal value for drainage easements in the 100-year flood plain is $75,000 per acre, there is no appraisal or backup for the statement. Descriptions of disciplines and an explanation of the blended hourly wages for each discipline were not included for Category C, nor did it make sense that "Consultant to be Selected" was listed when the plans are 95% complete for the storm drain improvements and the street improvements are at 50% complete. There is no explanation of how the unit costs were derived or obtained in Categories D, E, F, G, or H. The Budget doesn't coincide with the Schedule or the Work Plan. For example, approximately 51% of the Budget is for Street Improvements and Domestic Water Improvements, without any mention of this work in the Work Plan.

Schedule

The Schedule does not follow the items presented in the Work Plan and Budget, such as the finance development and waterline improvements tasks. The Schedule does not demonstrate a readiness to begin construction or implementation within 12 months after the anticipated award date (October 1, 2011). The construction contract is scheduled to be awarded on November 30, 2012, fourteen months after the anticipated award date of October 1, 2011.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. For example, some of the output and outcome indicators for improved regional flood protection and sustainable flood water management systems were identical as were desired outcome and outcome indicators. The narrative lists several goals and how they will be met and the how the outcomes will be measured. The focus of the "metrics" is reducing the costs of flood damage and economic losses, while increasing downstream water quality. The general metric is to compare costs before and after project construction. The output indicator for reduced erosion and sediment transport downstream that there will be reduced pollutant loads of trash, sediment, suspended solids, and heavy metals; however, Attachment 3 states that the trash and debris pollutant load is expected to remain the same. The measurement tool for determining if this goal is implemented is to monitor downstream berm damage and failures. The same outcome indictor and measurement tool are cited for the goal of improving water quality within the regional watershed. No monitoring, assessment and performance measures are proposed for the water improvements, street improvements or off-site street improvements.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits

Average levels of Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply benefits can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and/or supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. Some of the avoided costs claimed in Table 11 are not justified, and others are not well supported. For example, the business lost during a flood event, the utility costs avoided, and the burrowing owl habitat costs are not sufficiently justified or documented.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

Average levels of Water Quality and Other benefits can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and/or supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. Water quality benefits are well described, but the economic value is estimated as equal to the construction cost of the water quality component of the project, net of maintenance costs. These costs are escalated over time. This is not an appropriate way to estimate benefits. Other benefits are briefly mentioned but not quantified.

Program Preferences

The proposal demonstrates with a significant degree of certainty that a number of Program Preferences can be achieved by implementing the proposed project. Thorough documentation with breadth and magnitude is provided for the following Program Preferences: Regional Project or Programs, Effectively Integrate Water Management Programs and Projects within the Hydrologic Region and Practice Integrated Flood Management, Protect Surface and Groundwater, and Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently. However, Expanding Environmental Stewardship is not addressed.